



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/025,898	12/19/2001	Weiqliang Zhang	SUNMP034	9253

7590 08/11/2005

Albert S. Penilla
MARTINE & PENILLA, LLP
Suite 170
710 Lakeway Drive
Sunnyvale, CA 94085

EXAMINER

COFFY, EMMANUEL

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2157

DATE MAILED: 08/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/025,898	ZHANG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Emmanuel Coffy	2157	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 May 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Amendment

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on May 26, 2005. Claims 1, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, 20 and 21 were amended. Claims 1-21 directed to a method and system for "Remote System Controller for Use on a Distributed Processing Framework System and Methods for Implementing the Same" are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Objection to Claims 8, 11, 17 and 21 are hereby withdrawn.

3. The objections to the title and the abstract are hereby withdrawn due to the corrective actions undertaken by the applicant.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kavner (US 6,430,607) in view of Helmer et al. (US 6,411,991).

Kavner teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a remote request system and method which monitors and controls the execution of remote requests on an on-line services network. (See abstract)

Claim 1:

A process execution management system, the system comprising:

a controller system being accessible over a network to enable remote user access to data managed by the controller system, including, (See Fig. 1)

a data center component configured to include data required to execute a process by a processing resource that is in communication with the controller system; (See Fig. 1, index 104)

a first user interface component instance for enabling a first user interface to provide an interface to a first copy of the data center component, the first user interface being configured to notify the data center component of a change to the first copy of the data center component; and (See Fig. 1, Fig. 2, Fig. 3 index 102, col. 9, lines 40-45; col. 11, lines 56-65; col. 12, lines 23-29.)

a second user interface component instance for enabling a second user interface to provide the interface to a second copy of the data center component, the second user interface being configured to notify the data center component of a change to the second copy of the data center component, (See Fig. 1, Fig. 2, Fig. 3 index 102, col. 9, lines 40-45; col. 11, lines 56-65; col. 12, lines 23-29.)

Kavner fails to explicitly disclose wherein the data center component is configured to issue updates including the changes to each of the first copy of the data center component and the second copy of the data center component to each of the first and second user interfaces to maintain synchronized data between the first and second user interfaces having access to the data center component.

However, Helmer discloses data synchronization throughout. (See particularly col. 5, line 66-col. 6, line 64; col. 7, lines 8-19; col. 8, lines 1-44)

Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the service system articulated by Kavner with the data synchronization system disclosed by Helmer because if the data in the data center were lost, the data stored in the first and second copy would be the most recent.

Claim 2:

kavner teaches a process execution management system of claim 1, wherein the data center component is configured to register with a registry service. (See Fig. 1 index 135); See also col. 8, lines 6-17.

Claim 3:

kavner substantially teaches a process execution management system of claim 1, wherein each of the user interfaces obtains a copy of the data center component by communicating a request to the registry service. (See Fig. 1 index 135); See also col. 8, lines 6-17.

Kavner fails to explicitly disclose obtaining a copy of the data center component by communicating a request to the registry service. However, Helmer discloses obtaining a copy of the data center component. (See particularly col. 5, line 66-col. 6, line 64; col. 7, lines 8-19; col. 8, lines 1-44)

Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the service system articulated by Kavner with the

data synchronization system disclosed by Helmer because if the data in the data center were lost, the data stored in the first and second copy would be the most recent.

Claim 4:

kavner teaches the process execution management system of claim 2, wherein each of the user interfaces provides the registry service with a user interface identification. (See Fig. 1 index 135); See also col. 8, lines 6-17; Fig. 4A index 404, Fig. 4B, Fig. 5, index 410.)

Claim 5:

kavner teaches the process execution management system of claim 2, wherein each of the user interfaces provides the registry service with a user interface address. (See Fig. 4B - exported interface list)

Claim 6:

kavner substantially teaches the process execution management system of claim 5, wherein the data center component implements a refresh command to update each of the copies of the data center component. (See Fig. 1 index 135); See also col. 8, lines 6-17.

Kavner fails to explicitly disclose implementation of a refresh command. However, Helmer discloses such limitation. See col. 6, lines 39-46.

Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the service system articulated by Kavner with the refresh command disclosed by Helmer because this system would insure communication is established by sending the command on a regular interval.

Art Unit: 2157

Claim 7:

Kavner teaches the process execution management system of claim 6, wherein the data center component maintains each of the user interface identifications and each of the user interface addresses in an active list. (See Fig. 4B - exported interface list; see also col. 7, lines 36-48 – a logon implies an active list of users.)

Claim 8:

Kavner substantially teaches the process execution management system of claim 6 as discussed above wherein the data center component awaits receiving a refresh acknowledged command from each of the user interfaces.

Kavner fails to explicitly disclose the data center component, which awaits receiving a refresh acknowledged command from each of the user interfaces. However, Helmer discloses such limitation. See col. 7, lines 14-20 and col. 8, lines 26-32.

Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the service system articulated by Kavner with the refresh acknowledged command disclosed by Helmer because a refresh acknowledged command would add to the handshake thereby providing a robust protocol.

6. Claim 9, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kavner (US 6,430,607) in view of Helmer et al. (US 6,411,991) in further view of Godfrey et al. (US 6,662,217.)

Claim 9:

Kevner substantially teaches the process execution management system of claim 7, wherein the data center component removes a user interface identification and

Art Unit: 2157

a user interface address of the user interface failing to dispatch a refresh acknowledged command to the data center component. (See Fig. 4B - exported interface list)

Helmer discloses refreshed acknowledged command. See col. 7, lines 14-20 and col. 8, lines 26-32.

Neither Kavner nor Helmer explicitly disclose removing a user interface address of the user interface failing to dispatch a refresh acknowledged command. However, Godfrey discloses removing a computer from the list of registered clients. See col. 7, lines 61-64. Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the service system articulated by Kavner and the removal of unacknowledged refresh command disclosed by Helmer with the removal of a client from the list as disclosed by Godfrey because the list would be more accurate by reflecting the current list of registered clients.

Claim 10:

Kavner substantially teaches the process execution management system of claim 6, wherein each of the user interfaces awaits receiving a refresh command for a predetermined period of time. (See Fig. 4B - exported interface list)

Helmer discloses refreshed acknowledged command. See col. 7, lines 14-20 and col. 8, lines 26-32.

Neither Kavner nor Helmer explicitly discloses receiving a refresh command for a predetermined period of time. However, Godfrey discloses such limitation. See col. 7, lines 55-59.

Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the service system articulated by Kavner and the removal of unacknowledged refresh command disclosed by Helmer with receiving a refresh command for a predetermined period of time as disclosed by Godfrey because it would provide for predictable communication by sending a refresh command on a regular interval.

Claim 11:

Kavner substantially teaches the process execution management system of claim 10, wherein each of the user interfaces re-registers with the data center component if the user interface has not received the refresh command upon the passage of the predetermined period of time. (See Fig. 4B - exported interface list; See Fig. 1 index 135); See also col. 8, lines 6-17.

Kavner does not explicitly disclose not receiving the refresh command upon the passage of the predetermined period of time. However, Helmer teaches not receiving the refresh command. See col. 6, lines 39-46 and col. 7, lines 14-20 and col. 8, lines 26-32.

Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the architecture articulated by Kavner with the service system articulated by Helmer because a refresh acknowledged command would add to the handshake thereby providing a robust protocol would provide for predictable communication by sending a refresh command on a regular interval.

Neither Kavner nor Helmer explicitly discloses registration request for a predetermined period of time. However, Godfrey discloses such limitation. See col. 7, lines 55-59.

Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the service system articulated by Kavner and the removal of unacknowledged refresh command disclosed by Helmer with a registration request for a predetermined period of time as disclosed by Godfrey because it would provide for predictable communication by sending a refresh command on a regular interval.

7. Claims 12-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Godfrey et al. (US 6,662,217) in view of Kavner (US 6,430,607) in further view of Helmer et al. (US 6,411,991.)

Godfrey teaches a distributed test administration architecture that enables a system administrator to test one or more servers accessible by the Internet from a remote administration computer that implements a browser. (See abstract)

Claim 12:

Godfrey substantially teaches a method for remotely accessing, scheduling, monitoring, and submitting a process, the method comprising:

launching a controller code, the controller code configured to include a data center and a user interface code; (See Fig. 1, index 22, index 26, col. 3, lines 57-65.)

Art Unit: 2157

initiating a first instance of a user interface component by the controller code;
(See Fig. 8 index 214; col. 4, lines 28-31) (as part of the test set-up, the server sends test suite to the client.)

and monitoring an active status of the user interface if the data center has not received a request to change the data in the data center copy from the user interface.
(See col. 7, lines 25-28) (the event coordination structure tracks a set of events.)

Godfrey does not teach registering the data center with a registry service; However, Helmer teaches registering the data center with a registry service. (See Fig. 1 index 135); See also col. 8, lines 6-17. Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the architecture articulated by Godfrey with the registry system disclosed by Kavner because if the data in the data center were lost, the data stored in the registry would serve as back-up.

Neither Godfrey nor Helmer teaches maintaining a data center copy provided to a user interface synchronized with the data center if the data center has received a request to change data from in the another copy from the user interface.

However, Helmer discloses data synchronization throughout. (See particularly col. 5, line 66-col. 6, line 64; col. 7, lines 8-19; col. 8, lines 1-44.)

Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the architecture articulated by Godfrey and the service system articulated by Kavner with the data synchronization system disclosed by Helmer because if the data in the data center were lost, the data stored in the first and second copy would be the most recent.

Claim 13:

Godfrey substantially teaches a method for remotely accessing, scheduling, monitoring, and submitting a process as recited in claim 12 and discussed above. Godfrey does not teach initiating a second instance of a user interface component by the controller code; However, Kavner teaches said limitation as indicated (See Fig. 1, Fig. 2, Fig. 3 index 102, col. 9, lines 40-45; col. 11, lines 56-65; col. 12, lines 23-29.)

Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the architecture articulated by Godfrey with the service system articulated by Kavner because if the data in the data center were lost, the data stored in the second copy would be the most recent.

Neither Godfrey nor Kavner teaches maintaining a data center copy provided to another user interface synchronized with the data center if the data center has received a data change request from a user interface. (See col. 7, lines 21-26.)

However, Helmer discloses data synchronization throughout. (See particularly col. 5, line 66-col. 6, line 64; col. 7, lines 8-19; col. 8, lines 1-44)

Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the architecture articulated by Godfrey and the service system articulated by Kavner with the data synchronization system disclosed by Helmer because if the data in the data center were lost, the data stored in the first and second copy would be the most recent.

Art Unit: 2157

Claim 14:

Godfrey substantially teaches a method for remotely accessing, scheduling, monitoring, and submitting a process as recited in claim 12 and discussed above.

Godfrey does not teach the following limitations. However, Kavner teaches user interface. (See Fig. 4B - exported interface list);

registering the user interface with the data center; See Fig. 1 index 135); See also col. 8, lines 6-17.

Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the architecture articulated by Godfrey with the service system articulated by Kavner because identifying user interfaces would facilitate troubleshooting, and billing and control access.

Neither Godfrey nor Kavner teaches wherein maintaining the data center copy synchronized with the data center includes,

obtaining a copy of the data center by a user interface;

initiating a different instance of user interface component by the controller code;

updating the data center upon a modification to the data center copy. However, Helmer discloses the above limitations at particularly col. 5, line 66-col. 6, line 64; col. 7, lines 8-19; col. 8, lines 1-44.

Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the architecture articulated by Godfrey and the service system articulated by Kavner with the data synchronization system disclosed by

Helmer because if the data in the data center were lost, the data stored in the first and second copy would be the most recent.

Claim 15:

Godfrey substantially teaches a method for remotely accessing, scheduling, monitoring, and submitting a process as recited in claim 14, awaiting a receipt of a refresh acknowledged command from the user interface for a predetermined period of time. above. See col. 7, lines 55-59.

Godfrey does not teach wherein updating the data center upon the modification to the data center copy includes,

receiving a request to modify the data center copy;

dispatching a refresh command to the user interface, the refresh command being configured to update the data center copy so as to maintain the data center copy synchronized with the data center; However Helmer discloses the above limitations at col. 7, lines 14-20 and col. 8, lines 26-32 col. 7, lines 14-20 and col. 8, lines 26-32.

Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the architecture articulated by Godfrey with the service system articulated by Helmer because a refresh acknowledged command would add to the handshake thereby providing a robust protocol would provide for predictable communication by sending a refresh command on a regular interval.

Claim 16:

Godfrey teaches a method for remotely accessing, scheduling, monitoring, and submitting a process as recited in claim 15, wherein the data center unregisters the user

interface if a refresh acknowledged command has not been received from the user interface for the predetermined period of time. (See col. 7, lines 60-64.)

Claim 17:

Godfrey substantially teaches a method for remotely accessing, scheduling, monitoring, and submitting a process as recited in claim 15, wherein the user interface is configured to reregister with the data center if the data center copy of the user interface has not been refreshed for a specific length of time. (See col. 7, lines 60-64.)

Godfrey does not disclose user interface and registry service. However, Kavner does. (See Fig. 4B - exported interface list); and registering the user interface with the data center; See Fig. 1 index 135); See also col. 8, lines 6-17. Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the architecture articulated by Godfrey with the service system articulated by Kavner because identifying user interfaces would facilitate troubleshooting, and billing and control access.

8. Claims 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helmer et al. (US 6,411,991) in view of Kavner (US 6,430,607 in further view of Godfrey et al. (US 6,662,217.)

Helmer teaches a system and method for replicating temporary data created by a server. (See abstract)

Claim 18:

Helmer substantially teaches method for providing synchronized data to a plurality of remote user interfaces, the method comprising:

launching a controller code having a data center and a user interface code; (See Fig. 1, Fig. 2 and Fig. 3)

providing a copy of the data center to one or more user interfaces upon receiving a request from the one or more user interfaces; (See Fig. 4B - exported interface list; col. 5, line 66-col. 6, line 64; col. 7, lines 8-19; col. 8, lines 1-44)

maintaining the data center copy and data center synchronized if a data change request is received from any of the one or more user interfaces; and (See col. 5, line 66-col. 6, line 64; col. 7, lines 8-19; col. 8, lines 1-44)

Helmer does not specifically teach maintaining and updating a list of one or more active user interfaces, the list of one or more active user interfaces is configured to include a user interface identity and a user interface address for each of the one or more active user interfaces; and monitoring an active status of the one or more user interfaces if the data change request has not been received. However Godfrey does See col. 7, lines 20-25 and lines 48-49 and (See Fig. 4B.)

Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the architecture articulated by Helmer with the service system articulated by Godfrey because identifying user interfaces would facilitate troubleshooting, and billing and control access.

Neither Godfrey nor Helmer teaches registering the data center with a registry service; initiating a first user interface component; However, Kavner does (See Fig. 4B - exported interface list) (See Fig. 1 index 135); See also col. 8, lines 6-17.

Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the architecture articulated by Helmer and the service disclosed by Godfrey with the registry system disclosed by Kavner because if the data in the data center were lost, the data stored in the registry would serve as back-up.

Claim 19:

Helmer substantially teaches a method for providing synchronized data to a plurality of remote user interfaces as recited in claim 18, wherein maintaining the data center copy and data center code synchronized includes,

dispatching a refresh command to the one or more user interfaces; (See col. 6, lines 39-46.)

awaiting for a previously determined period of time to receive a refresh acknowledged command from the one or more user interfaces; and (See col. 7, lines 14-20 and col. 8, lines 26-32.)

receiving the refresh acknowledged command from the one or more user interfaces. See col. 7, lines 14-20 and col. 8, lines 26-32.)

Helmer does not specifically teach one or more user interfaces. However Kavner does. (See Fig. 4B - exported interface list).

Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the architecture articulated by Helmer with the service system articulated by Kavner because identifying user interfaces would facilitate troubleshooting, and billing and control access.

Neither Helmer nor Kavner teaches awaiting for a previously determined period of time. However Godfrey does. See col. 7, lines 55-59. Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the architecture articulated by Helmer and the service system articulated by Kavner with the system of Godfrey because a refresh acknowledged command sent at regular interval would add to the handshake thereby providing a robust protocol.

Claim 20:

Helmer substantially teaches a method for providing synchronized data to a plurality of remote user interfaces as recited in claim 19, the method further including, deleting one or more user interfaces from the list of active one or more user interfaces if a refresh acknowledged command has not been received for the user interface. (See col. 6, lines 39-46; col. 7, lines 14-20 and col. 8, lines 26-32.)

Helmer does not specifically teach one or more user interfaces. However Kavner does. (See Fig. 4B - exported interface list).

Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the architecture articulated by Helmer with the service system articulated by Kavner because identifying user interfaces would facilitate troubleshooting, and billing and control access.

Neither Helmer nor Kavner teaches deleting one or more user interfaces. However Godfrey does. See col. 7, lines 61-64. Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the architecture articulated by Helmer and the service system articulated by Kavner with the

Art Unit: 2157

removal of a client from the list as disclosed by Godfrey because the list would be more accurate by reflecting the current list of registered clients.

Claim 21:

Helmer substantially teaches a method for providing synchronized data to a plurality of remote user interfaces as recited in claim 20, the method further including, receiving a re-register command from the user interface of the one or more user interfaces if the user interface has not received the refresh command for a specific length of time.

Helmer does not specifically teach one or more user interfaces. However Kavner does. (See Fig. 4B - exported interface list).

Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the architecture articulated by Helmer with the service system articulated by Kavner because identifying user interfaces would facilitate troubleshooting, and billing and control access.

CONCLUSION

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 2157

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Emmanuel Coffy whose telephone number is (571) 272-3997. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 - 5:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-3997. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Emmanuel Coffy
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2157

EC
July 28, 2005


ARIO ETIENNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100